



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

# THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY

Entered as second-class matter November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 3, 1879

VOL. IV

NEW YORK, MAY 6, 1911

No. 26

The Classical Association of the Middle West and South held its seventh annual meeting at St. Louis, April 7-8. The various sessions were well attended; many of the members came long distances, and spent two entire days at the meeting, in addition to the time required for travel to and fro. When one remembers how magnificent are the distances in the territory covered by the Association, one gets a fresh sense of the extent to which some members at least prize the opportunity of meeting their fellows in the annual gatherings. The programme was long, but, thanks to the skill with which the President of the Association, Professor B. L. D'Ooge, of the Michigan State Normal School, Ypsilanti, Michigan, conducted the sessions it went through on schedule time. The plan of nominating in advance some one to discuss each paper worked much better this year, particularly in one or two cases where the author had sent his paper in advance to the person who was to open the discussion. One particularly good instance of this deserves special mention. Mr. I. N. Judson, of the Soldan High School, St. Louis, read a paper on *The Interpretation of the Ancient World through the Classics in the Secondary School*. The paper merely restated what has been urged so often, that we must give to our classical courses a content which shall arouse a more general interest and impart a broader culture if we wish them to maintain their position in the secondary school. Papers of this sort almost invariably are pessimistic in effect, if not in origin and purpose. Mr. L. N. McWhorter, of the Central High School, Minneapolis, who had been appointed to open discussion of this paper, had written some careful remarks upon it, which, on the whole, were the most inspiring single utterance of the whole meeting. He bade teachers of the Classics keep their courage, remarking among other things that inferences based upon talk of the total *percentage* of pupils now studying Latin as compared with the percentage so employed at an earlier day might be distinctly misleading; the percentage of pupils studying Latin might be diminishing without diminution of the *number* studying Latin. More pupils of every kind are going to the High School now—many of these, in earlier days, would not have been in the High School at all—and so there is no need to despair if many of them are not studying Latin.

There was a curiously large array of papers akin

in theme and contents to the paper of Mr. Judson, referred to above: how we are to make the Classics interesting half a dozen papers sought to explain. But the danger that the meeting might be wrecked on the rocks of pessimism was happily escaped—there was always some one with good sense who averted the threatened peril, and made sane and healthy views prevail. One speaker scored heavily when he pointed out that he had heard all sorts of remedies suggested for the improvement of classical teaching—save one, and that the very remedy which seemed to him personally the most effective of all, to wit, the constant reading by the teacher of the classical authors, that the teacher's knowledge of Greek and Latin literature, of Greek and Roman life, and appreciation of that literature and that life may become ever deeper and surer. This speaker was in accord with Professor Wild's remarks at the meeting of The Classical Association of New England (see *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 4.185).

Professor Franklin H. Potter, of the University of Iowa, discussed *Oral Latin and Greek*. I did not hear all of this paper, and so may perhaps be in error in saying that he distinguished the direct method, the conversational method and the oral method of teaching a foreign language. He gave a very interesting account of experiments in the use of the oral method in first year work. For several weeks at a time a class had worked entirely without books, using also two periods a day, with no home work; later again for a time books were used, the class meeting but once a day, and having now home work to do. Mr. Potter made in this connection the suggestion which has been set forth more than once in *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* by Professor Lodge, that we need in our classical teaching, for the greatest effectiveness, some of the conditions which our scientific brethren are fortunate enough to have, to wit, extra periods and small classes, and a far more elaborate equipment than we at present possess (compare here Professor Harrington's views, as indicated in 4.170). It is to be hoped that readers of *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* will hear from Professor Potter in the coming year.

There were several informational papers of interest. Professor J. B. Pike, of the University of Minnesota, discussed Apuleius and the Milesian Tale, holding that the term *Milesiaca* was applied originally to local histories of Miletus, then to stories il-

lustrative of city life, and finally to short stories of any sort. Professor F. W. Shipley, of Washington University, St. Louis, discussed Prose Rhythms in Latin. Professor A. S. Pease, of the University of Illinois, had a very interesting paper on Sneezing as an Omen. Professor Charles E. Little, of Peabody College, in a paper entitled The Misplacement of a Paragraph in Cicero's *De Imperio*, called attention to the fact that in § 36 Cicero promises to speak of Pompey's *innocentia*, *temperantia*, *fides*, *facilitas*, *ingenium*, and *humanitas*, but that in taking up this matter in detail in §§ 37-42 he has a different order of subjects, thus: *innocentia*, *temperantia*, *facilitas*, *consilium*, *dicendi gravitas* et *copa* (= *ingenium*), *fides*, *humanitas*. He argued that in § 36 we ought to put the phrase *quanta fide* after *quanto ingenio*. It was clear that many teachers of Cicero had never noticed the discrepancy to which Mr. Little was calling attention. Thus far the paper did a good service. The author also distributed copies of a very excellent analysis of the whole speech. I propose to compare this with analyses of the oration in the various editions; it may prove worth while to print the analysis in full in THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY, if the author consents. Professor H. W. Johnston, of the University of Indiana, expressed himself as unconvinced by the paper (the author had sought to find also manuscript evidence for his transposition, particularly in the 1584 edition of Lambinus): he pointed out that since Cicero was addressing the people, the democratic party, he quite naturally brought to the fore in § 41 Pompey's *facilitas*, his approachability, his democratic ways. I myself made the point that the arrangement in § 36, in the outline, is better than the arrangement in §§ 37-42, for in the outline we have in *innocentia*, *temperantia*, *fides*, *facilitas*, four moral or quasi-moral (spiritual) characteristics grouped together, followed by a group of two mental or intellectual characteristics (in *ingenium* and *humanitas*). Professor Little's transposition destroys the continuity of both groups. In making the formal *partitio*, then, Cicero was following strictly the rules of the schools. In working out details, however, for a special motive clearly enough indicated by Professor Johnston, he brings forward out of place a matter likely to carry special weight with the audience. That audience would not have noticed the variation consciously (this is clear enough from the fact, noted above, that teachers who *read* the speech annually do not notice it); unconsciously to themselves, however, they would get the special impression which Cicero meant to make by bringing *facilitas* forward out of its place. Professor Hale, in a paper on Latin Order, sought to show that our grammars are worse than useless in their pronouncements on Latin word-order, because the grammarians have

thus far used a wrong method in attempting to solve the problem. He then offered himself what he called the right method. To determine the unemphatic or normal and the emphatic position of various classes of adjectives (possessive, numeral) and of the limiting genitive, he quoted what he called typical or decisive examples. Professor A. T. Walker of the University of Kansas made by implication and Professor Knapp in terms the point that all Professor Hale's typical examples involved chiasmus, to the Romans the automatic and unconscious mode of expression, and that he was thus himself wrong in method. Professor Hale also condemned Greenough's discussion of Latin word-order, in a way that showed that he was not familiar with Professor Greene's better treatment of this theme (see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 2.2-4, 2.10-13, 2.13-215. On the general theme see also The School Review 27. 230-243 and THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 2.130-134, 3.25-28).

The resolutions of The Classical Association of New England, mentioned in 4.185, 186, were reported by the Executive Committee with a resolution for their adoption, but they were on motion referred back to the Committee for further consideration and report next year. It seemed to some that the proposed council was needless, since, they argued, The American Philological Association is a national body, ready to take up classical questions of national import, and that the proposed federation might interfere with the Philological Association. But, it may be noted, the Philological Association has only 600 members (whereas the three organizations involved in the proposed federation have 2,700 members): many of these are not teachers at all, and few of them are secondary teachers. Finally, the Philological Association thus far has been most reluctant to consider matters of a pedagogical character, especially in connection with the schools.

One other very delightful feature was an informal gathering at the Planters' Hotel, the night before the meeting began, of a number of men, who discussed wholly informally the various problems of research on which they are now engaged.

Socially the meeting was most successful. To the great convenience of every one the sessions of Friday morning and afternoon were held at the Planters' Hotel, which is easy of access from the Union Depot. On Friday night, at the Wednesday Club, a woman's organization, a paper was read by Professor C. H. Moore, of Harvard University, on Greek and Roman Ascetic Tendencies, and Professor Shorey talked on The Case of the Classics. On Saturday the sessions were held at Washington University, which is beautifully located in the outskirts of the city, to the west; among other advantages of this day was the opportunity of seeing the fine Saalburg Collection, of special value to

teachers of Caesar (see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 2. 100-102).

One came away from the meeting as a whole with decidedly optimistic feelings and with the conviction that the cause of the Classics in the Middle West and South is in good hands. C. K.

#### A CHAPTER FROM AN UNPUBLISHED LATIN SYNTAX, WITH PREFATORY DISCUSSION

(Concluded from page 196.)

It would be a comparatively simple matter to give the laws governing the use of *antequam* (*priusquam*), if it were true and sufficiently definitive to say that the Indicative was used wherever the dependent verb denoted an actual fact or something viewed as an actual fact, and the Subjunctive wherever the dependent verb expressed something Proposed, Expected or Anticipated or something viewed as Proposed, etc. Such, however, is not the case, and the situation is further complicated by the fact that the presence of a negative in the main clause in some categories alters the tense and affects the question of mood.

The reason for this influence of the negative becomes manifest when we consider that *antequam* itself, as Professor Gildersleeve says of  $\pi\eta\lambda\upsilon$ , is a *comparative* formation; from this a distinctly *negative* character follows.

Since it is itself negative, the importance of the negative, expressed or implied, in the leading clause is obvious; for the free negative nullifies the negative in the conjunction and inverts the antecedence and subsequence of the principal and subordinate clauses. This is necessarily significant in a language whose ground plan of tense-usage is based upon the antecedence and subsequence of actions whose time is brought into comparison.

Even after this has been noted, however, the question of tense is not solved, for no strictly logical scheme of tense-usage is followed.

In general, the choice of a tense in Latin in a subordinate clause depends upon the relation of coincidence, antecedence, or subsequence existing between the action of the principal and that of the subordinate verb. In the case of *antequam*, 'before', however, this relation of priority and subsequence seems sufficiently indicated by the conjunction itself. This affords a baffling and elusive problem. The Present Indicative occurs in some future sentences, the Future Perfect in others, and the simple Future is excluded from use. In a certain type of sentence the relation of priority and subsequence seems to have been felt by the Latin writer to be sufficiently indicated by the meaning of the conjunction and is not indicated by the tense, while in sentences of another type both the conjunction and the tense are deemed necessary to express the relationship.

In the 'generic sentence' of the Present after an

affirmative leading clause, the Present Subjunctive is generally used in the *antequam* clause; but after a negative leading clause the Perfect Indicative is the rule.

In regard to the Subjunctive, it at once appears how difficult it is to make a comprehensive statement. It can be fairly well demonstrated that, in *past* sentences in which the action of the subordinate clause was 'looked forward to', the dependent clause employed the Imperfect Subjunctive; but the same principle applied to *future* sentences is not verified by the usage of the language, for a large majority of such sentences with affirmative leading clauses use the Present *Indicative*, while practically all with negative leading sentences use the Future Perfect Indicative. Some grammarians cite the Present Subjunctive in 'general truths' as an extension of the so-called 'anticipatory' Subjunctive; but these same 'general truths', as stated above, quite regularly employ a Perfect *Indicative*, if the leading clause is negative.

These and other considerations have forced me, after many efforts at condensation, to the conclusion that it is hardly possible to give an adequate statement without making a definite distinction between present, future, and past time, and between affirmative and negative sentences under each.

The limits of this paper will not permit my giving the statistics or grounds for the rules given in Part II. These have been given at length in my published work on the subject<sup>1</sup>, which was based upon a study of all examples of *antequam* (*priusquam*) occurring in the Latin literature down to the end of the first century of our era. It is desirable, however, that the reader be acquainted with the special considerations which have influenced part of the statement in regard to the usage after 'an affirmative leading sentence of the past', even though this cannot be done satisfactorily in so short an article.

In establishing what should be the statement here, several considerations must be kept in mind.

It is fairly evident that the usage of Cicero has been mainly responsible for the rule that, when the dependent clause denoted a fact or bore a simply temporal relation to the leading clause, the Indicative should be used; for in Cicero we find nearly twice as many examples of this Indicative as are found in all of the other prose writers combined down to Suetonius. Cicero has fifty-two examples of the Perfect Indicative in the *antequam* clause after an affirmative leading sentence; Caesar has none; Sallust has one, and it may be questioned; Nepos has none; and Livy, out of a total of more than one hundred and fifty examples with affirmative past leading sentence, has only three Indicatives.

<sup>1</sup> *Antequam and Priusquam. With Special Reference to the Historical Development of their Subjunctive Usage.* The Lord Baltimore Press (1903). 107 pages.